DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 526 IR 006 097

AUTHOR Cieslicki, Dorothy
TITLE ACLCP Periodical Storage Center: Feasibility Study, September 1974-April 1975.
SPONS AGENCY Pennsylvania State Library, Harrisburg.
PUB DATE Apr 75
NOTE 21p.; Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Costs; *Feasibility Studies; Government Publications; Library Cooperation; *Library Materials; *Library Networks; Models; *Periodicals; Planning; Reference Materials; *Storage; Tables (Data)

ABSTRACT

A study of alternative models for establishing a cooperative storage center for little used library materials by the members of the Area College Libraries of Central Pennsylvania (ACLCP) focused on periodicals. Considerations discussed include advantages--lower cost; space for growth and better access to holdings retained in active collections; decreased duplication by continuous weeding; possibility of creating a depository for outdated government documents and a single copy file of outdated reference service items; (2) models provided by existing systems: Hampshire Inter-Library Center--a jointly owned research collection supplementing library holdings of participating institutions; Center for Research Libraries--a scholarly store of seldom used potential research materials; New England Deposit Library--overflow of materials from 12 major libraries in the Boston Area; and Medical Library Center of New York--medical journals, texts, and monographs transferred from 30 medical libraries in New York City; and (3) storage options for ACLCP--a decentralized system where each library copes with its own storage problems; a shared retention plan; the creation of a physically separate cooperative storage center; or participation in a storage center operated on a statewide or larger scale. Recommendations favor creation of a separate facility for ACLCP libraries. (Author/MBR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED157526

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ACLCP Periodical Storage Center

Feasibility Study

September 1974 - April 1975

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dorothy Cieslicki

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Prepared by Dorothy Cieslicki
Dickinson College Library

IR006097

The question of the feasibility of establishing a storage center for little used library materials currently held in the libraries of ACLCP members has many aspects. I would like to present some general considerations, describe some existing models on whose experience we may draw, and suggest alternative solutions, including one which I would like to recommend.

The idea of conducting a cooperative storage center study has been mentioned in ACLCP meetings for over two years, so the reader may infer that the problem has existed in most libraries to a varying degree for several years. The success of ACLCP in dealing with many issues since its organization in 1965 through shared cooperative action has been an important factor in the strengthening of the service and resources we are able to offer to students attending member colleges. Its members can boast of the equivalent of a two-million volume collection available on request. The lack of a union catalogue of monographic holdings of the 17 libraries involved, however, is a serious stumbling block in the path of complete utilization of these holdings. Fortunately there does exist a union list of periodical holdings in ACLCP libraries, the corrected and revised edition of which is due to appear in September, 1975. This list is of inestimable value in obtaining material for students in original or copy form on interlibrary loan.

Another significant cooperative project first conceived of by ACLCP members and brought to fruition through the support, leadership, and participation of the State Library of Pennsylvania in the Department of Education of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the district libraries of the public library system is the interlibrary delivery system, known to its users as IDS. For a uniform annual fee each member library is visited three times a week by an ACLCP driver and van bringing it material requested on interlibrary loan. The system originally served central and south-central Pennsylvania colleges and public libraries, but in January, 1975, it was extended to cover the entire state, a total of approximately 90 libraries.

Working together, the members of ACLCP have improved their service significantly with a uniformly applied charge and no loss of autonomy or ownership by each participating institution. These activities require considerable expenditure of staff time in-house and payment of membership subscription fees, the ultimate effect of which is to increase resources greatly with a minimum of expenditure. No long-term indebtedness has been incurred, and the organization has been able to function effectively to date without incorporation. Each library has seen participation in ACLCP and IDS as a benefit to its students and institutions.

The next major cooperative undertaking which ACLCP members want to consider is a cooperative storage center for little used library materials. I have arbitrarily narrowed the scope of my study to periodicals because we have much better bibliographic control of periodicals and because they are a constantly growing source of shelving pressure and budget problems, as opposed to the more static nature of monographs. Their removal to storage would also free a maximum amount of shelf space in the active library with a minimum of labor and expense in selection and record changing.

There are several obvious reasons for turning to a cooperative storage center. First, it is expected to save money for the participating libraries by providing book storage space that is less costly to build, equip, and service than the on-campus library, inasmuch as it would not provide for general public access. Second, it is expected to provide space for growth and better access to holdings retained in the active collection, postponing the need for expansion of the on-campus library building. Third, it should improve collections by reducing duplication and forcing the development of a continuous weeding and retirement program in the active collection.

The requirements for a successful cooperative storage center are relatively few. It should provide less costly storage than the space from which its contnents were removed. It must provide bibliographic control and quick access to its contents. It should provide a storage environment that insures a maximum lifespan through control of temperature and humidity and protection from fire, flood, insects, and vandalism.

In addition to the storing of little used periodicals and servicing of interlibrary loan requests from them, other activities for the ACLCP storage center were suggested by members of the group. The idea of creation of an ACLCP depository of a single copy of out-dated government documents which would parallel the official depository collection of the State Library of Pennsylvania was viewed favorably by both the State Library and other partial depository libraries in ACLCP. This would be subject to compliance with established discard procedures. The creation of single-copy file of outdated reference series items was also considered a desirable possible type of holding. The possiblity of the creation of a clearinghouse of duplicate issues of periodicals was suggested. Many libraries are also in favor of developing an acquisitions program to provide a single copy of otherwise unavailable periodicals or important out-of-print material issued on microfilm.

I decided that is would be worthwhile to investigate existing cooperative storage centers to benefit from their experience and try to fit their solutions to our problems. I found four major centers which offered helpful models and ideas for different aspects of our planning.

The Hampshire Inter-Library Center was established in 1951 to provide a jointly owned research collection to supplement the holdings of the libraries of its participating institutions. Its members include the local regional public library in western Massachusetts as well as college and university libraries. The academic participants, now five in number, are similar in course offerings and purposes, are located close to each other geographically, have a history of cooperative interaction, and all have problems of crowding in their libraries. The Center is currently operating very successfully with an active acquisitions program and relatively heavy use of material on site and through interlibrary loan.[1] Holdings are concentrated in serials and sets, with funding provided by uniform dues from member institutions. The librarians' council and selection committee meet monthly almost year-round. A policy is followed of limiting holdings to single copies of important materials which are little used, to the exclusion of the unwanted or inconsequential.[2] The result has been to create another library of a highly specialized research nature.

The Center for Research Libraries, a non-profit corporation located in Chicago, holds a unique scholarly store of seldom used materials of potential value in research. Originally established as a cooperative storage facility for the use of its founding members, the libraries of large midwestern universities, it has since added a vigorous acquisitions program and members from all parts of the United States. Material is received through deposit by members and original purchase. When the Center opened it offered a choice of four categories of ownership of materials deposited in the center, i.e., outright gift with transfer of title, permanent loan, defined as not subject to recall but with ownership remaining with the depositor, temporary loan subject to recall, and temporary storage. The Center has experienced its own space problems and presently denies deposit in the last two categories. In general, when offered identical material in both the first and second categories, it follows the policy of accepting outright gifts. Holdings are strictly limited to a single copy of items of research value not commonly available.[3] In the near future the Center is expecting to expand greatly its serials subscription program and increase its shelving capacity through new building. It prides itself on its quick service, practically cost-free to members. Full and associate members qualify on the basis of the

---

[1] Hampshire Inter-Library Center Newsletter, 19 (July 1, 1974) :1.

[2] A Guide to the Hampshire Inter-Library Center (Amherst: Hampshire Inter Library Center, 1968), p. 1.

[3] Center for Research Libraries, Handbook (Chicago: Center for Research Libraries, 1973), pp. 101-114.

size of their holdings and acquisitions budgets and pay an annual scaled fee. Membership in the Center is not a small item. For colleges the size of all ACLCP members except Pennsylvania State University the fee is .6 percent of the average total budget for books, periodicals, and binding. One member of ACLCP, the State Library of Pennsylvania, is a member of the Center for Research Libraries. It is limited to borrowing from CRL only for patrons who come directly to it and may not forward interlibrary loan requests from other institutions. Geared primarily to research on the graduate level, the Center for Research Libraries has value for an undergraduate library chiefly in providing items for very occasional use by students and faculty, relieving the college library of the need for acquiring and housing these items.

The New England Deposit Library was opened in 1952 to provide shelving for the overflow of materials, both new and old, that twelve major libraries in the Boston area had been unable to cope with individually. The building was built on land given by one of the members and with the help of a loan from a member college. In a building with a capacity of 1.5 million volumes each library is free to deposit or withdraw from its stored holdings anything it pleases, and fees are charged on a space rental basis. There has been no effort to eliminate duplication, and aside from joint efforts in the initial construction, no other cooperative benefits have resulted.

A fourth cooperative storage center, the Medical Library Center of New York, is a smaller scale and hybrid version of the preceding three. It houses medical journals, textbooks, and monographs transferred from thirty medical libraries in a multi-story building in New York City purchased with the aid of foundation grants. Sponsoring and participating libraries pay an annual fee of $10,000 and $3,000 respectively (1974).[5] The two basic categories of deposit are outright gift and rental storage. Rental storage is intended to be short term to meet temporary space needs, with materials so stored serviced by the Center staff but available for use only by the renting library on a charge per transaction basis in addition to the rental fee. The purchased acquisitions are chiefly current journal subscriptions not held by member libraries. Photocopies are supplied via the Center's delivery system, and an in-house microfilming program is planned for deteriorating journals and newspapers.

---

[4]Robert Muller, "Toward a national plan for cooperative storage and retention of little-used library materials," in Resource Sharing in Libraries, ed. Allen Kent (New York: Marcel Dekker, 1974), p. 120.

[5]Ibid., p. 123.

[6]Jacqueline W. Felter, "The Medical Library of New York: a progress report," Medical Library Association Bulletin 56 (1968):19.

Let us now consider the storage options open to ACLCP members. First, each library might choose to go it alone, retaining full autonomy in all decisions and bearing all expenses.

A second possibility is development of a shared retention plan which is based on retention of all holdings in member libraries with no expectation of ever building or equipping a separate permanent storage center. This plan has a background and future possibilities which I would like to discuss in a later paragraph. The third possibility is to develop presently a shared retention system in the individual libraries, identifying and preparing the selected materials, and eventually removing them to a central storage center. In the two preceding instances development and implementation of a shared retention system would undoubtedly require the services of a coordinator authorized by a directing council from ACLCP.

The fourth system would permit the immediate transfer of unlimited duplicate runs of journals to a central storage center for cooperative retention, rental storage, or disposal. A fifth alternative is to anticipate the establishment of a state-wide or multistate storage center. The sixth alternative is to consider individually or as a group the support of nationwide acquisition, storage, and loan centers and no longer hold little used materials available from them.

The first proposal, an independent storage center, is being investigated presently by Pennsylvania State University. Mr. William Pierce, chief of facilities planning for the libraries of Pennsylvania State University, supplied me with the following figures on the cost of construction and equipment for an on-campus building for the storage of little used library materials which the university is considering building. His estimate for a 10,000 square foot building of the Butler type, a metal shell on a poured concrete base, which would hold 100,000 volumes allowing 12 volumes to the foot and using two-deck metal shelving 22 feet high, was $150,000. This building will have minimum heat and portable facilities for altering the humidity. Mr. Pierce regarded extreme dryness as more of a problem than excessive humidity. A small office is to be partitioned off, and the contents will be serviced by a circulation attendant from the main library. Pennsylvania State University does not believe it feasible for them to attempt to participate in a storage with us because of the disparity in size of collections.[7]

The second proposal is presented in great detail by Hendrik Edelman to the members of the New York Metropolitan Reference and Research Library Agency (METRO) in 1969. This agency is an association of nearly 70 public, special, small academic, and university

---

[7]Telephone conversation with Mr. William Pierce.

libraries created to make information in the 30,000,000 volume holdings of these libraries available to researchers in the New York metropolitan area. Its basic proposal is that one or more member libraries take responsibility for the retention of last copies of certain types of material or material in a defined subject area, providing direct access if possible and servicing interlibrary loans. After each library has identified holdings within its collection of expected low use, Edelman then recommends that this material be moved to the library within METRO designated as a retention center for that subject area, where its use would be optimal, with ownership to be assumed by the designated retention center.[8] While similar relocating within ACLCP libraries might not prove beneficial, we could at least consolidate broken runs.

Mr. Edelman pay special attention to the plight of the small academic library. He assumes that each such institution will meet its responsibility to acquire, house, and service a collection adequate to its curriculum needs. He urges the coordination of acquisition of specific expensive items among member libraries, elimination of duplication in ordering of periodical titles, and subject specialization in library purchasing among colleges geographically convenient to one another, as well as the establishment of a weeding program in each library. He makes the point that colleges need not fear the loss of accreditation if they weed their collections or deposit obsolete material off campus.[9]

Reassurance on this point was given by Robert Kirkwood, executive director of the Federation of Regional Accrediting commissions of Higher Education at the conference on resource sharing in libraries held April 11-12, 1973, in Pittsburgh, Pa. "There are some who still seem to believe that unless a library has significant strength in its back collections the institution will not be accredited. Again that is a myth....Access to back collections by all means, but not every campus needs or should have long shelves of journals and periodicals whose only function is to collect dust and take up space....When resource sharing can amplify the range and dimension of learning materials available, what could be more consistent with the purposes of accreditation?"[10]

---

[8]Hendrik Edelman, Shared Acquisitions and Retention System (SHARES) for the New York Metropolitan Area; a Proposal for Cooperation among METRO Libraries (New York: New York Metropolitan Reference and Research Library Agency, 1969), p. 14.

[9]Ibid., p. 8.

[10]Robert Kirkwood, "Resource sharing and accreditation," in Resource Sharing in Libraries, ed. Allen Kent (New York: Marcel Dekker, 1974), p. 53.

The advantage of the second plan are numerous. It eliminates the establishment, staffing, and servicing of an additional "library," it makes at least the same amount of material available to all libraries, and it frees space in every library. Unfortunately, it does not offer a significant easing of pressure in the stacks of those libraries which are already uncomfortably full, unless they elect to sell or discard large amounts of holdings and count on their availability from another retaining library. This is of no help to state-related institutions in particular, which are legally restricted from disposing of state property. Within the four Central Pennsylania Consortium colleges we have had limited success in reducing duplication of current titles. Most ACLCP librarians felt that it would be impossible to distribute among the members permanent responsibility for current acquisition of specific journals because institutional priorities might force them to drop an assigned title. Indeed, the entire concept would be tenuous and ultimately unworkable without the appointment of an individual responsible for overseeing communications and relocation of materials, if it is found desirable.

The third plan, creation of a physically separate cooperative storage center, is the next step bevond shared in-house retention, to be taken if and when agreement on operating principles and financial support can be reached. In determining the feasibility of establishing a physical storage center it is necessary to identify the costs involved in creating and operating it in terms of the total initial capital required and the annual income required for operating and maintenance expenses. If the building is constructed specially to meet storage requirements, the cost of land, structure, and shelving are the major one-time expenditures. If an existing building is used, the cost of renovation and shelving are the major one-time expenditures. An additional one-time cost for each participating library is the professional library and faculty personnel time used to identify and schedule library holdings for removal to storage, as well as the time spent in changing holdings and location records. Ongoing expenses include staff salaries and fringe benefits, IDS fee, utilities, and supplies.

We may use the figures supplied by Pennsylvania State University as valid for the cost of constructing and equipping a minimal storage building. However, it does not include land costs, and estimates of volume capacity are undoubtedly high for periodicals. Twenty-five volumes per three foot shelf is the figure commonly used for periodicals, as opposed to the thirty-six per three foot shelf used in Mr. Pierce's estimate.

It is difficult to make any meaningful statements about the cost of renting a building except in terms of a specific building in a particular location on a given date. I soon found this out when I approached realtors in the area around Harrisburg and Carlisle. The first question the realtor asks is, "How large a building do you require?" Based on the replies to the first questionnaire I circulated I know that any definite answer I

might give would be meaningless, since the potentially heaviest contributor had a factor of two in the range of his reply and has meanwhile redistributed much deposit material to the Center for Research Libraries. Many of the other librarians said, "You tell me what you are planning and how much it will cost, and then I'll tell you how much I intend to deposit." The decision to limit deposits to a single copy or allow unlimited duplication also has a bearing, as does the choice of shelving. The amount of space considered desirable for future growth is another factor. The prevalence of vandalism means that more than usual care must be taken in choice of location. Consideration should also be given to location relative to the established IDS routes and availability of suitable personnel, although these both allow considerable latitude in geographical choice of location. The structural requirements for a high load-bearing capacity (150 lb./ft.^{2}) and loading dock accessibility are also peculiar to our needs.

The problem resolved itself in a limited way with the offer of Wilson College to rent to ACLCP two permanent storage buildings in the middle of their campus, soon to be vacated by the art department. The buildings are 10 foot tall metal shells on poured concrete bases 40' x 60', with all utilities and heated by ceiling-hung electric hot air heaters equipped with fans. They are subject to condensation on roof skylights in cold winter weather, which drips to the floor below. For these reasons the ceiling and lighting will require alteration. Most attractive is the $1.00 per square foot per year rental asked by Wilson, which will include utilities and security protection. Rather than try to speculate on a wide range of improbable possibilities, I decided to try to identify the cost of establishing these two buildings as a storage center.

TABLE A

ONE-TIME EXPENSES

Alteration of 2 ceilings - $4,600.00 each[11]	$9,200.00
Alteration of lighting - $1,350.00 per building[12]	2,700.00
Alteration of heating and installation of air conditioning and ductwork in one building[13]	11,235.00

---

[11]Estimate supplied by E. D. Plummer Sons, Inc., General Contractors, Chambersburg, Pa.

[12]Estimate supplied by Frank B. Lesher Co., Electrical Contractor, Chambersburg, Pa.

[13]Estimate supplied by Kottcamp Construction Co., Chambersburg, Pa.

Shelving -

Movable compact

Estey - consisting of 2 fixed ranges 33' long and 21 movable ranges 33' long, with 7 usable shelves, 6 of them adjustable, 12" deep. Assuming volume thickness of 25 volumes/3 foot shelf, capacity per building is 88,550 volumes. Storage density is 37 volumes/ft.^{2}[14]. Cost per building is $92,000.00, delivered and installed.

Fixed location

Republic Steel - Consisting of 300 units per building, 3' wide x 1' deep x height, laid out on 24" aisles.

Height	Cost per building	Capacity per building	Density
7'	$10,000	52,500 vol.	22 vol/ft.^{2}
8'	$11,500	60,000 vol.	25 vol/ft.^{2}

Prices include delivery but no installation. The shelving density given assumes a constant shelf spacing of 12", with the number of usable adjustable shelves equal to to the height in feet, and volume thickness of 25 volumes/3 ft. shelf.[15]

Penco Products - Consisting of 270 units per building, 48" wide x 12" deep x 99" high, with open ends and backs, shelves spaced 13" apart, laid out on 23" aisles. Provides 7560 lineal ft. of st orage in each 40 x 60 ft. area, using 7 shelves in each unit. Capacity and storage density are figured on the basis of 25 vol./3 ft. shelf.[16]

Nut and bolt shelving, cost per 40 x 60 ft. building, not including taxes. $10,730

Clip type shelving, cost per 40 x 60 ft building. $11,050

Shipping charges, approximate. $320

---

[14]Estimate supplied by Mr. Wayne Baker, Estey Corporation Drawer E, Red Bank, N. J. 07701.

[15]Estimate supplied by H. E. Fortna & Bro., Inc., Harrisburg, Pa.

[16]Estimate supplied by Mr. David Curry, Penco Products, Inc., Oaks, Pa. 19456.

Installation charges per building	$2,500
Capacity per 40 x 60 ft. building	63,000 vol.
Density	26 vol/ft.^{2}

Sperry Rand - Aurora snap lock shelving - Consisting of 7675 linear feet of shelf space in one 40 x 60 building, with a capacity of 63,900 volumes and a storage density of 26 volumes/ft.^{2} Cost is $19,000 per building, delivered and installed.[17]

It is difficult to make meaningful comparisons of costs with the figures supplied above. In TABLE C presented later in the text I have attempted to compensate for any disparities and to calculate costs on a comparable basis. The original figures are presented for the reader's reference and use in making other types of comparisons.

TABLE A gives working estimates of the major initial fixed costs of establishing the two Wilson College buildings as compact storage centers. Ceiling alterations are necessary to eliminate dripping condensate. Estimates are given for alteration to the lighting, to provide flourescent lighting in 15 aisles 40 feet long. The cost of electrical alterations and lighting may be considerably less with movable compact storage, some designs of which have self-contained lighting. It is possible to ignore the need for close temperature and humidity control, but probably short-sighted, since cycling through swings of temperature and relative humidity cause much more rapid deterioration of library materials. For effective long-term preservation of paper the relative humidity should be held in the range of 45-55 per cent and the temperature in the range of 70°-80° F. The danger limit of relative humidity is 68 per cent, at which point mold and fungus growth begin over a wide range of temperatures.[18] If microfilm is stored, much closer tolerance of both temperature and relative humidity must be maintained constantly. To provide bearable working conditions year-round and protection for stored microfilm I have included the cost of altering the heating and ventilation of one building. I have assumed that the second building will be filled to the limit with stored materials and entered infrequently.

The shelving I have investigated provides two methods of achieving a high storage density as measured by the number of volumes per square foot of floor space. The movable book stacks with fixed end ranges and capability of moving all other ranges

---

[17]Estimate supplied by Mr. John K. Landis, Jr., Commonwealth Office Systems, Inc., Lemoyne, Pa. 17043.

[18]Carl J. Wessel, "Environmental factors affecting the permanence of library materials," Library Quarterly 40 (January 1970):61.

electrically eliminate almost all need for aisle space and permit a correspondingly higher density of storage. They have a comparatively higher initial cost and a fixed height of 7-1/2'. The manufacturers claim that they permit up to a 100 per cent increase in storage density over conventional public library stacks. Shelving costs are given for closely spaced (22" aisles) stationary shelving with the standard vertical shelf spacing, but shelving by size will undoubtedly require additional shelves. The fixed shelving is industrial quality, without backs, tops, or end panels, and with a capacity to adjust spacing of shelves to permit shelving of materials by size. Fire and insurance regulations require that lighting be at least 18" from any flammable material. This precludes using shelving higher than 8'.

TABLE E

ANNUAL OPERATING COSTS

Rent at $1.00/ft.^{2} for two buildings, 40' x 60'	$4,800.00
Supplies	300.00
Salaries plus fringe benefits	12,000.00
Interlibrary delivery service	675.00

Repayment of loan for building renovation and equipment varies according to the length of the repayment period. It can be computed using the repayment schedule given below.

Schedule for repayment of $10,000 loan borrowed at 10 per cent

Repayment period	Monthly payment due
10 years	$132.16
15 years	107.47
20 years	96.51
30 years	87.76

Staffing is an area which allows for some latitude in level of expertise required at various stages of the development of the center. Let us assume that much preliminary work is carried out in the participating libraries, that an agreement is reached to use single copies of each title, and that the length and size of runs is predetermined. This arrangement places the burden of work on libraries in proportion to the amount they are depositing or disposing of and calls for a professional coordination of these efforts before the materials appear at the storage center. A paraprofessional could then be trained to service incoming interlibrary loan requests and add new materials to the initial store. The professional's services could probably be phased out in one or two years, with increased use made of paraprofessional or clerk staffing. I have assumed an annual expenditure of money for salaries of $12,000, for both professional and nonprofessional personnel. The present annual cost of IDS is $675.00. If TWX service is deemed necessary

to provide fast service, a cost of $100.00 per month must be included. In the event that request via IDS is considered satisfactory, this item can be dropped. There are additional expenses for office supplies for which I have included a budget item of $300.00, an item which would be increased to a minimum of $1200.00 if electrostatic copies are supplied. Rental of a copier can be avoided if circulation of the stored single copy is agreed on as acceptable.

In a sample computation I have given below the annual cost of operating both buildings as completely filled storage facilities, assuming a 20 year repayment period for the money required for initial alterations, with and without onebuilding air-conditioned. In cases where the shelving supplier did not include cost of installation I have added a one-time item of $5,000 to cover this expense.

TABLE C

Total annual operating cost

Shelving supplier	Total annual cost	Cost/vol./year
Republic - 8' high shelving	$23,680	19.7 cents
With air conditioning	22,400	18.66 "
Without a/c		
Penco - clip-type shelving		
With a/c	23,565	18.7 "
Without a/c	22,360	17.75 "
Aurora - snaplock shelving		
With a/c	24,838	19.4 "
Without a/c	23,565	19.2 "
Estey		
With a/c	41,398	23.4 "
Without a/c	40,125	22.5 "

It is useful to compare our cost per volume in whatever combination of shelving, personnel, and renovation cost we may decide on as reasonable to those reported in the literature. One of the most fully documented plans put into operation is that of Yale University. In its storage building it used standard shelving 10" deep at floor level on 20" aisles, with books shelved by six sizes on foredges up to 10 shelves high to a maximum density of 60 volumes/ft.[2] [19] Using the Yale compact storage system Dinka and Okutcu find that it provides housing for library materials at $0.115/volume/yr., or 1/5 of the cost per volume of the conventional active collection, $0.52, taking into account initial construction costs and annual operating costs at the time of their study,

---

[19] Herman H. Fussler and Julian L. Simon, Patterns in the Use of Books in Large Research Libraries (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), p. 134.

which took place in 1970.[20] Contrast these costs with the annual costs per volume by Fussler and Simon in 1961 of $0.03 to $0.05 for compact storage costs, compared with $0.135 in conventional housing.[21] The rapid increase in construction costs and annual operating costs in recent years make these absolute values relatively meaningless. However, their general relationship is roughly the same. It is necessary that each potential participant in a cooperative storage program determine the level of savings and cost that will justify participation.

It is fair to assume that operating costs can only increase every year, but increase in the base of support will probably come only through the inclusion of district public libraries as participants. The district public librarian in Lancaster with whom I spoke is enthusiastic about cooperating and participating in any way feasible, particularly in cooperative acquisitions. This library has a schedule of systematic conversion of as many periodical titles as possible from paper to film, either commercially or in-house produced.

The fourth plan, immediate removal to a permanent storage center of all material which any participating library might want to deposit, would almost certainly require the availability of rental space, as well as permanent storage, if only one copy is to be held in permanent storage. It would put a heavy burden on the manager of the center because of the great influx of material and the necessity of carrying on sorting, storing in many different locations, and disposal of duplicates as well as creation of a holdings catalog simultaneously. The personnel startup cost, instead of being dispersed among member libraries, would be concentrated and attributed to the storage center. It would also require a much larger storage volume than the one I have considered on the Wilson campus, if rental is allowed on a permanent basis.

The fifth plan, to cooperate and participate in a storage center operated on a statewide or larger scope, is now in the conjecture stage. The Pennsylvania State Bureau of Library Development, while it has not specifically mentioned this project, is interested in encouraging as many cooperative undertakings as are worthwhile among libraries in the state. A spokesperson for the Lehigh Valley Association of Independent Colleges, a consortium which is also taking active steps to establish a storage center, has stated that their studies point to the ultimate desirability of a much larger area as a collection base, to provide economical delayed access storage of both monographs and periodicals. Dr. Virginia Sternberg, associated until recently with the Pittsburgh Regional Library Center, reports that a storage center has been in the background of future plans of this group for several years.

---

[20] Tesfaye Dinka and Davut Okutcu, An Analysis of Book Storage and Transportation Requirements of the Five Associated Libraries (Syracuse: Five Associated University Libraries, 1970), p. 10.

[21] Fussler and Simon, ibid., p. 140.

They might be potential participants.

In giving consideration to the idea of participation in a nationwide storage center, I can only repeat the advice of two librarians closer to this scene. Forrest Carhart, executive director of METRO, stated that he felt that it would perhaps be wiser for the members of METRO to give financial support ot the development of the Center for Research Libraries in Chicago, rather than create a separate storage center in the New York metropolitan area, as they are even now considering doing.[22] Gordon Williams, director of the Center for Research Libraries, cautioned against saddling ourselves with a large physical plant and putting group money into acquisitions that we might find readily available through inter-library loan elsewhere later.[23] The last two alternatives may seem remote now, but with passing time they may become more attractive to consider.

Several basic issues must be resolved before we can contemplate taking the steps necessary for the creation of a separate physical storage center. Who will own the material in the center, the incorporated body which operates the center or the depositing library? Is equal financial support to be expected from all participants, should support be scaled according to use and amount of material deposited or should there be perhaps a two-level membership fee? Must all members of ACLCP be supporting members of a storage center? Must a commitment to membership in the center be regarded as permanent, so long as the college or library continues to exist? Is the collection to be a single copy of each item? Should we circulate the original or a copy, or perhaps hold two copies of as many things as possible, to provide for a circulating copy, remembering that every duplicate we hold doubles the cost for access to the same amount of material? Should the storage center maintain rental space along with a single-copy store for use by all ACLCP members?

The problems inherent in the makeup of the group and the economic times make any decision a difficult one. The legal restrictions on the options open to state-related institutions seem to demand a special treatment for this group. The general reluctance of administrators to diminish the number of library holdings by yielding ownership is common, as is the unwillingness of faculty members to accept delayed access to something they no have immediately available on campus. This latter attitude was addressed by Robert Muller at the previously mentioned resource sharing conference...."researchers and scholars must lower their expectations and not insist on immediate delivery of little-used materials. If users continue to be unreasonable, cooperative storage will not be realized."[24]

---

[22]Interview with Mr. Gordon Williams, Chicago, Illinois.

[23]Interview with Mr. Forrest Carhart, New York, N. Y.

[24]Muller, ibid., p. 126.

All libraries want the benefits of off-campus storage, but some need them more urgently than others. A particularly difficult problem lies in the range of urgency of the space and money problems faced by the ACLCP libraries. It is my impression from interviews during visits to each ACLCP library that five have severe space problems existing now, that three anticipate space problems in the next three to five years, and that seven are reluctant to commit themselves immediately and permanently to use of a storage center, either because they have just completed an expansion or are currently planning a drive for funds to carry out expansion, or because they are uncertain of being able to carry this additional expense in their current operating budget. All members stress the need for caution in spending and future commitment, suggesting variously a trial run, making provision for withdrawal from participation in the center, and gradual entry through the shared retention plan. Most librarians believe that a shared acquisitions program to be carried on in the various libraries is too extended an arrangement to be reliable, and one questioned whether we could rely on shared retention agreements.

While eleven of fourteen librarians replied in my first questionaire that they could always or usually accept the single copy principle, the reply to a second questionnaire I sent out puts this in doubt. I circulated a list of 227 titles appearing on the current edition of the ACLCP Union List of Periodicals which have ceased publication and are held by more than one member library. I asked the responding librarians to designate for each title if (A) they would be willing to deposit and yield ownership, (B) they would deposit indefinitely and retain ownership, or they would continue to hold this title indefinitely on their own campus, whether it be used regularly (X) or little used (Y). 108 titles with a total of 146 replies were marked A, to be deposited as outright gifts. Of these 108 titles only 31 were not held more completely either by libraries willing to deposit in the B category or not intending to deposit. This would permit the immediate removal of 115 runs from active collections. Admittedly these may be short or broken holdings. 130 titles with a total of 220 replies were marked B, or to be deposited with ownership retained. Of these 130 titles 50 were held as completely in libraries not wishing to deposit, but presumably making copies available for inter-library loan, leaving 80 titles as potential candidates for deposit, many of them held at least partially in duplicate. Thus 140 runs in this second group represent potential space rental material.

There are several observations to be made about this limited list of ceased titles. First, it presents an opportunity for space gains without creation of a storage center, by combination of broken runs and disposal of duplicate materials identified as discardable. If we had a clear statement of the availability of the in-library copies of these 227 titles for interlibrary loan, it might be possible to discard many of the titles in the B category. Second, there is great reluctance to accept the single-copy principle.

There is much additional potential deposit material being held by libraries, such as ceased titles held by only one member and the early part of long runs of current titles. Because the Union List of Periodicals to be published in the fall of 1975 will contain some omitted titles, eliminate others now included, and clear up many discrepancies of entry and holdings, it did not seem worthwhile to attempt to use the current list to extract more information for this study.

I would like to recommend that we initiate a program of shared retention of periodicals, government documents, and dated reference items. I would like to recommend further that we rent from Wilson College the two buildings mentioned earlier, equip both of them with closely spaced industrial type shelving, and use them to house the three classes of material listed above, limiting periodicals to a single-copy title, and sharing expenses equally among all ACLCP members. In the beginning space available in the second building could be rented by member libraries on a temporary basis to be used as best suits their needs, with rental fees sufficient to cover all expenses of operating the building and servicing requests from the stored collections. It would be preferable to initiate the shared retention program one year before undertaking the rental of the two buildings, but this is probably an unreasonable request to make of Wilson.

If the directors of ACLCP give serious consideration to this proposal, I would suggest that they hire a professional librarian to undertake the development of the shared retention program. I would also suggest that the reference committee and government document librarians in ACLCP libraries start work on determining lists of reference items and documents and documents series suitable for deposit and designate a member library as the deposit center for each title or series. It is especially important for documents librarians to begin work promptly because of the slow deaccessioning procedure they must follow.

In an effort to hold expenses to a minimum and so that all libraries will be financially able to participate, I would suggest that we rely on transmission of interlibrary loan request by IDS and that no provision be made for duplicating in the storage center, but that borrowing libraries copy requested material when received. I would suggest that the Wilson buildings be altered now to meet long-term safe storage conditions,amoney and material saving move in the long run.

It is desirable that the center have access to reference and bibliographic material in the Wilson College library if necessary. While the experience of other storage centers suggests that we should begin a journal acquisitions program in the center to include otherwise unavailable titles in our joint holdings, I would suggest that we defer this until we have a firmly established storage center and reliable figures on the cost of satisfactory operation. This would also give us time to observe the success of the Center for Research Libraries in its projected plan to establish itself as a national periodicals lending center.

The rental of space in the second building should be looked on as temporary, a means to carry the cost of rental of the building until the cooperative storage of periodicals expands to include the capacity of both buildings. If inexpensive rapid access to a much larger store of periodicals from other sources makes it economically unattractive for us to house them cooperatively, the two buildings on the Wilson campus might then become storage centers for a specialized type of material such as government documents or serial publications requiring a minimum of personnel attention. With flexitility in our planning we would be able to put these buildings to continuous good use.

In the future the creation of a union catalog electronically through the entry of retrospective holdings in the Ohio College Library Center data bank or other inexpensive means of electronic communication may make it attractive for libraries located near each other to consider the construction or rental of cooperative monographic storage centers. ACLCP members may want to investigate the idea of a much larger storage center operated under guidelines similar to those of the New England Deposit Library, forgoing any idea of cooperation.

A cooperative storage center should have definite goals, which can be helpful guidelines in decision making, and strong leadership and support to carry out these decisions. Flexibility in incorporating developments in the larger library world and in making changes dictated by our experiences is also necessary. A cooperative storage center, if it is established, must be looked on as a long-range permanent commitment of money and personnel to achieve the greater good for all participants at the least cost.

Bibliography

Center for Research Libraries. Handbook. Chicago: Center for Research Libraries, 1973.

Dinka, Tesfaye, and Davut Okutcu. An Analysis of Book Storage and Transportation Requirements of the Five Associated Libraries. Syracuse: Five Associated University Libraries, 1970.

Edelman, Hendrik. Shared Acquisitions and Retention System (SHARES) for the New York Metropolitan Area; a Proposal for Cooperation among METRO Libraries. METRO Miscellaneous Publication No. 3. New York: New York Metropolitan Reference and Research Library Agency, 1969.

Ellsworth, Ralph E. Economics of book storage in College and University Libraries. Metuchen: Scarecrow Press, 1969.

Felter, Jacqueline W. "The Medical Library Center of New York: a Progress Report." Medical Library Association Bulletin 56 (1968):15-20.

Fussler, Herman H. and Julian L. Simon. Patterns in the Use of Books in Large Research Libraries. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

A Guide to the Hampshire Inter-Library Center. Amherst: Hampshire Inter-Library Center, 1968.

Hampshire Inter-Library Center Newsletter 19 (July 1973-June 1974).

Harrar, H. Joanne. "Cooperative Storage." Library Trends 19 (Jan. 1971): 318-328.

Kent, Allen, ed. Resource Sharing in Libraries. New York: Marcel Dekker, 1974.

Lee, James D. "Book Storage as one Aspect of Cooperation." Southeastern Librarian 21 (Fall 1971): 161-168.

Metcalfe, Keyes. The Hampshire Inter-Library Center; a Survey of its Background and its Problems with Recommendations for the Future. South Hadley: Hampshire Inter-Library Center, 1957.

Shisko, Robert, and Jeffery Raffel. Systematic Analysis of University Libraries. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1969.

Simkin, Faye. Cooperative Resources Development; a Report on a Shared Acquisitions and Retention System for METRO Libraries. METRO Miscellaneous Publication No. 5. New York: New York Metropolitan Reference and Research Library Agency, 1970.

Simon, Julian L. "How many books shoud be stored where?" College and Research Libraries 28 (March 1967):92-103.

Wessel, Carl J. "Environmental Factors Affecting the Permanence of Library Materials." Library Quarterly 40 (Jan. 1970): 39-84.